HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY Intellectual Property Administration P.O. Box 272400 Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400 **PATENT APPLICATION**

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. ______200311998-1

Inventor(s): Leslie Louis Szepesi, Jr et al

Application No.: 10/777321

Filing Date: Feb 12, 2004

Confirmation No.: 5556

Examiner: Ricardo Osorio

Group Art Unit: 2629

Title: Calibration Of A Voltage Driven Array

Mail Stop Amendment Commissioner For Patents PO Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TRANSMITTAL LETTER FOR RESPONSE/AMENDMENT

X Other Restriction						Fee\$					
=::-	CLAIMS AS	AMENDE	D BY OT	THER	THAN A	SMA	LL E	YTITY			
(1) FOR	(2) CLAIMS REMAINING AFTER AMENDMENT	(3) NUMBER EXTRA	(4) HIGHEST NUMBER PREVIOUSLY PAID FOR		(5) PRESENT EXTRA		(6) RATE		(7) ADDITIONAL FEES		
TOTAL CLAIMS		MINUS				=	0	х	\$50	\$	0
INDEP. CLAIMS		MINUS				=	0	х	\$200	\$	0
	FIRST PRESENTATION	ON OF A MU	JLTIPLE I	DEPE	NDENT C	LAIM		+	\$360	\$	0
EXTENSION FEE	1st Month \$120	2nd I	Month 0		3rd Mont \$1020	, 🗆		4th Month \$1590		\$	0

Charge \$ 0 to Deposit Account 08-2025. At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account 08-2025 pursuant to 37 CFR 1.25. Additionally charge any fees to Deposit Account 08-2025 under 37 CFR 1.16 through 1.21 inclusive, and any other sections in Title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations that may regulate fees. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

Leslie Louis Szepesi, Jr et al

By:

Timothy F. Myers

Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

Reg No.: 42,919

Date: 7/26/07

Telephone: 541 715 4197

Rev 02/07 (E-TransAmd)

200311998-1 Restriction Response

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Leslie Louis Szepesi, et al.

Title: CALIBRATION OF A

VOLTAGE DRIVEN ARRAY

Appl. No.: 10/777,321

Filing Date: February 12, 2004

Examiner: Ricardo Osorio

Art Unit: 2629

RESPONSE TO ELECTION OF SPECIES REQUIREMENT

Mail Stop Amendment Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to your Office Action dated July 16, 2007, Applicant respectfully traverses Examiner's statement that "[c]urrently, claims 1 and 13, and 19 are generic." Applicants believe that claims 1, 2, 4, 9-13, 16, and 18-19 are each generic and read on each species.

Applicant further respectfully traverses the Examiner's statement that the non-restriction would cause a "burdensome examination." There are only 3 species and the Examiner has not set forth a reason why searching the remaining species would be burdensome given the nature of the subject matter and the scope of the prior art.

Applicant further respectfully traverses the election of species requirement. The election of species requirement is improper because the election of species requirement is made to features that are <u>not</u> mutually

200311998-1 Restriction Response

exclusive. MPEP 806.04(f) is clear that claims to be restricted to different species must be mutually exclusive. In other words, different species must be mutually exclusive. Species II and Species III are not mutually exclusive from Species I and therefore searching on either Species II or Species III will require searching on Species I.

In view of the foregoing, the Applicant respectfully requests that the requirement for restriction be withdrawn upon reconsideration. However, to further prosecution, Applicant provisionally elects the species II of Figure 3 on which claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-16, and 18-19 read. If upon examination any generic claims are found to be allowable, further species claims that include or incorporate the elements of the generic claim would contain patentable subject matter that would warrant full examination.

Respectfully Submitted,

Timothy F./Myers
Patent Attorney

Registration No. 42,919

Hewlett-Packard Company Legal Department 1000 NE Circle Blvd. Corvallis, OR 97330 Telephone: (541)715-4197

Fax: (541)715-8581